



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/878,193

06/12/2001

Yuji Sato

0717-0469P

1968

2292

7590

10/04/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

FATAHI YAR, MAHMOUD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/878,193

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Fatahiyar

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Allen et al(6,233,689).

Allen et al disclose an image display system comprising at least one display device(10) connected to a host device(14) for displaying an image outputted from the host(column 2, lines 45-50; column 3, lines 9-14 and figure 1) wherein at least one display device monitors a state of coupling with the host device(column2, lines 59-67; column3, lines 1-27).

As to claims 2, 4, and 11, relative to the limitation monitoring the state of coupling based on "a supply voltage level or a data-enable signal from the host" such is also taught by Allen et al(column3, lines28-67 and column 4, lines 1-37).

In claim 3, as to the limitation "a plurality of display devices interconnected to one another and each monitors a state of coupling", Allen et al also disclose that their computer system is coupled to a network or other devices by a modem wherein each computer system is capable of utilizing an interface circuit(2) for determining the status of respective coupling line(column 2, lines 59-67).

Art Unit: 2674

In regard to claim 6, Allen et al also teach that their monitoring circuits are powered at all times, thus, constantly monitoring the coupling status(column 4, lines 62-67).

As to claim 8, Allen et al also teach the concept of utilizing a timing circuit(325) for monitoring the coupling state during a specified period(column 8, lines 61-67 and column 9, lines 17-38).

As to claims 13-14 and 16-17, Allen et al also teach the concept of utilizing a power management system(315) for independently administering the power of the computer(10) when the coupling with the host computer(14) is canceled(column 9, lines 18-65; figures 1 and 7).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 7, 9, 12, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Solhjel et al(5,375,245).

Allen et al is discussed above. Solhjel et al teach a power management unit(8) for controlling independently the power of monitor(3) when the coupling state of the monitor(3) is disconnected from the computer unit(1)(column 4, lines 15-68 and figure 5). It should be noted that the coupling state of the monitor(3) with the computer unit(1) is determined based on synchronization clock signals detected by the synchronization pulse detector(4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to modify the system of Allen et al with the above noted teaching of Solhjell et al such that to determine the coupling state based on a data transfer clock signal because both references are related to a power management for a monitor when the coupling state is disconnected from the host and further because Allen et al utilizes an edge detector(320) for detecting the edge of a clock signal in their power management system(315).

In claims 7, 9, 12, 15 and 18 as to the limitations "constantly monitoring the coupling state", "monitoring the coupling state during a period set by a timer" and "independently administering power management when the coupling state is canceled" all are shown to be old by Allen et al, as outlined above in regard to claims 6, 8, 13-14 and 16-17.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Anwyl et al, Kikinis, Pollard et al, Narui et al, Mitchell et al, Choi et al, Lee, Nookala et al and Lonoce et al all are made of record to show various types of power management system for a monitor when there is no activity detected from a host.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mike Fatahiyar** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-6911**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

M. Fatahiyar ^{MF}

September 30, 2003



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600